

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1591

grain—and such a program would probably wipe out the entire grain surplus.

The 1957 Presidential Commission, however, found that no blend of less than 10 percent would be practical, that this would require over 2 billion bushels of grain—more than was available in surplus then—and that plants to process such an amount would cost about \$2 billion—and would probably have to be built by the Government—and that total cost to the public, in higher prices for gasoline alone, would be over \$1 billion a year.

Major problem involved in making cheap alcohol from grain is to remove the protein before fermentation of starch for alcohol (or before starch is taken out for other industrial uses) in order to upgrade the protein into a human food. If this problem could be licked, the resulting alcohol would be a byproduct, with the cost then low enough to compete with oil in making gasoline.

The Presidential Commission acknowledged that a vigorous research program might find a solution to the problem and that possibly the byproduct alcohol cost might be low enough to compete with petroleum.

On the Senate floor, Senator CURTIS pushed for a new research effort on the protein extraction problem—saying (as he has many times in the past): "It has long been my hope we could use alcohol produced from grain as a part of our motor fuel."

He said that "improved methods" of upgrading the protein for humans would make protein worth many times its value as a livestock food and that the alcohol will then "become more or less a byproduct and it can be sold at a price to compete with gasoline."

CURTIS said oil companies "have no valid ground for alarm over the inauguration of such a program"—the petroleum industry should be interested in solving the farm problem (which is a big item in the Government's budget)—and farmers are oil's best customers. CURTIS also asserted that alkyl-gas would still be distributed by the petroleum industry and that "they (oil companies) will not lose—rather they will gain."

Very truly yours,

MILBURN PETTY.
JAMES M. COLLINS.

Mr. CURTIS. We welcome the comment and interest of these spokesmen for the petroleum industry. There is no conflict of interest between the farmers who want an outlet for their surpluses and the petroleum industry when all the facts are in.

THE CASE OF WILLIAM A. WIELAND

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I want to say for the record that I am glad the Internal Security Subcommittee is pursuing an inquiry into the State Department security risk cases identified by Reporter Sarah McClendon at the President's news conference January 24, 1962.

The case of William A. Wieland especially deserves the closest, possible investigation. Here is a man, a State Department official, who has been denounced by four former U.S. Ambassadors in public testimony as untrustworthy, incompetent, a supporter of leftist elements in Latin America, and as instrumental in the fall of Cuba to communism.

I regret that the President saw fit to leap to the defense of accused security risks in such an impetuous fashion. I

am sorry that he turned aside Mrs. McClendon's question in such a manner as to cause it to be interpreted as a rebuke.

As the Kilgore (Tex.) News-Herald commented:

Press conferences are for asking questions, not sweeping them under the rug. If there are any more questions about security risks, let them be asked, even at the risk of rebukes. The Nation needs to know about such things.

I believe that the majority of Americans share my concern regarding this incident. I believe they share my concern about accused and known security risks occupying important positions in the State Department.

My mail has been heavy in quantity and 100 percent in support of Mrs. McClendon's inquiry into these State Department security cases. I have heard that White House mail has predominately supported Mrs. McClendon. I have been advised that the various press headquarters in Washington have received mail addressed to Mrs. McClendon, supporting her.

I quote the following excerpts from mail received in my office:

Long Beach, Calif.:

Mrs. Sarah McClendon, by her courageous action, has opened the door for a long overdue probe of the State Department.

Midland, Tex.:

Your fellow Texan, Sarah McClendon, asked President Kennedy the \$64,000 question that has been a matter of concern for years to those of us who are fearful of our State Department in these perilous times.

Venice, Calif.:

Heartiest congratulations plus to Sarah McClendon.

San Diego, Calif.:

Sarah McClendon's questions should be the wedge to open all doors. Offer a bill to give her the DSC or DSM.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place several articles and editorials on this subject in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Jan. 30, 1962]

THE WIELAND AFFAIR

One year ago this month the conservative magazine National Review charged that a man who went by the name of Arturo Guillermo Montenegro was once a terrorist in Cuba, and that with the backing of Franklin Roosevelt's Under Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, this man rose rapidly in the State Department to become head of the Caribbean desk under his real name, William Arthur Wieland.

National Review also said that two former Ambassadors to Cuba had linked Mr. Wieland to the Castro takeover. The magazine said Arthur Gardner had told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that William Wieland had supported leftist elements in Latin America and had contended that the Castro movement was not Communist. Earl T. Smith said Mr. Wieland was a Castro admirer.

Robert C. Hill, former Ambassador to Mexico, testified that Mr. Wieland was neither a competent officer nor a man who could be trusted. And William D. Pawley, former

Ambassador to Brazil and Peru, said Mr. Wieland's activities in Rio de Janeiro were "of a nature that was displeasing to me although there was nothing specific I could put my hands on."

This was apparently the extent of published information which was derogatory to Mr. Wieland until Correspondent Sarah McClendon identified him at a Presidential press conference last week as one of two well-known security risks. The President denied the two men were security risks, and said he hoped Mrs. McClendon's question had not done harm to the men's reputations.

We surmise that those sharp words will not mark the end of the Wieland affair. The American people are entitled to know more about this man's background. If it is as clear and clean as the President says, Mr. Wieland will have nothing to lose and much to gain by a full revelation of his past.

[From the El Paso Times]

EVERYDAY EVENTS

(By W. J. Hooten)

Sarah McClendon, who has been Washington correspondent for the Times since 1947, found herself in the news again as the result of asking a question of President Kennedy at his press conference last week.

Which caused Associated Press Writer Arthur L. Edson to observe:

"Nobody—especially a President of the United States—has ever been able to ignore Sarah McClendon."

"This plump, reddish-haired correspondent for 14 newspapers from Texas to New England has always had a knack for irritating a Chief Executive."

Writing about Sarah at the Presidential press conferences, Edson said:

"In theory a President can answer or ignore anyone he wants to."

"In practice he usually recognizes the most persistent and the loudest."

"Here Sarah McClendon was in her element."

"She usually gets a seat up near the front, and leaps quickly to her feet. Possibly no reporter has asked as many questions as she has."

"Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower used to seem particularly nettled by her, and—or so it seemed to other reporters—he would play little games by pointing to those around her and acting as if he didn't see her at all."

"But, sooner or later, her persistence paid off, and he would nod her way."

It is difficult to decide whether AP Writer Edson was being complimentary to Sarah McClendon, or whether he was just doing some factual reporting the way he saw it.

GETS ENCOURAGEMENT

After Sarah's brush with President Kennedy last week she wrote me that telegrams and long-distance calls of congratulations and encouragement came from all parts of the country. She said several offers of "money if needed" were made. She wrote that a member of the New York Stock Exchange interrupted transactions "on the floor" to call to offer backing and to say, "If you need money let me know."

A group of women in Mesa, Ariz., called Sarah to offer their encouragement and added, "If you need any letters written, let us know."

A STANCH DEMOCRAT

I have known Sarah McClendon personally for 15 years. I admire her spunk, although at times I fear she is a little persistent at Presidential press conferences.

I'm wondering what her brush with President Kennedy will bring. Sarah is a stanch Democrat and she was for Kennedy even before he received the nomination.

1592

MRS. MCCLENDON VERSUS J.F.K.

(By Holmes Alexander)

President Kennedy held his 21st Presidential news conference January 24, and it was a so-so performance.

Not even a cub reporter would write such a lead as that—a stale, listless, so-what sentence—but I have a reason. A whole lot of daily reporters praised Mr. Kennedy's last performance (James Reston of the New York Times said J.F.K. was "in his glory") so far beyond its merits that the bug of suspicion begins to bite.

What goes on here? A cult of the personality? A conspiracy of illusion about the Emperor's new clothes? Murray Marder of the Washington Post and Bill Knighton of the Baltimore Sun were among those who overpraised the handsome, articulate, popular world-famous young man who is often brilliant but who, last week (and the week before) was in a conspicuous slump.

His most publicized rejoinder to Reporter Sarah McClendon was not the icy, sharp, shrewd riposte which some front-page accounts made it appear. Mrs. McClendon got by far the better of the exchange. She mentioned "two well-known security risks" and instantly named them when the President challenged her. She was taloned and merciless for the kill. He was flustered and so much on the defensive that his grammar and sequence broke down, giving me a nostalgic sense of return to the Eisenhower era.

Moreover, for the first time in anybody's memory, the conference was abruptly terminated nearly 5 minutes ahead of the customary half hour. To the astonishment of all around me, there came an abrupt, "Thank you, Mr. President," almost as if Press Secretary Salinger had signaled from the stage for somebody to get his man out of the ring.

While the President quit early, Mrs. McClendon was quickly surrounded by a stellar group of reporters, led by Eddie Follard, of the Washington Post, and Bob Donovan, of the New York Herald Tribune, who drafted her for an impromptu press conference of her own.

Mr. Kennedy's admirers in the press credited him with quick thinking in coming to the defense of William Arthur Wieland and J. Clayton Miller, who Mrs. McClendon named as "security risks." My opinion is that Mr. Kennedy made one of the big blunders of his White House career. J. Clayton Miller is a new man in town, but William Arthur Wieland, whatever his official security rating, is almost indefensible as a State Department public servant.

No less than four former ambassadors—Smith, Pawley, Gardiner, and Hill—have denounced Wieland by name as instrumental in the fall of Cuba to communism. Both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have found Wieland to be an embarrassment and have tried to hide him in the State Department's organizational maze. Wieland is an ex-newspaperman who left journalism and entered diplomacy under circumstances that the President of the United States ought not to be defending. Had Mr. Kennedy, a former member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a former newsmen, really been as informed and quick-witted as ballyhooed in the press notices, he would have known enough about Wieland to play this one some other way.

When Mr. Kennedy is good in a press conference, he is very, very good, and he is never really bad except by his own high standards. He pays the penalty extracted from all champions and artists of being under pressure to deliver a masterpiece at every attempt. Perhaps it is uncharitable to hold a top national leader up to tests that are not by any means the full measurement of his powers and performance.

But the point is that his strikeouts, ought to be reported as faithfully as his home runs—for a very special reason. It is an open secret that Mr. Kennedy plays favorites, bringing writers and publishers as guests to the White House, thereby setting up a situation for reciprocal trade of favors. Already it is routine conversation at the National Press Club to speculate whether an extreme "snow job" column of flattery by a non-Kennedy columnist, or a cozy, "inside" think piece by an influential journalist, is a bread-and-butter note.

There is no harm, and a lot of good, in the President's consorting with newspaper friends. But let's not permit sweet friendship to cloy the acid of skepticism in which every political writer's pen should be dipped.

[From the Kilgore (Tex.) News Herald, Jan. 28, 1962]

ASK A QUESTION

Most Presidential press conferences are pretty dull stuff so far as producing anything new for the reader. Questions are anticipated and the President, who has been briefed, has a ready answer.

It's the unexpected, and sometimes critical, question that upsets a President, as President Kennedy was upset when Reporter Sarah McClendon indicated that two well-known security risks had been put on a State Department task force to help reorganize its security office. In the flareup, much was made of Kennedy rebuking the reporter, and how irked he was over the incident. In this case, the feelings of President Kennedy are of little consequence, and even any detriment to the character of the men in question is not as important as any possible detriment to the Nation's interests. The point is that if there is any possibility of security risks being on the administration's staff, such a question as posed by the reporter is pertinent. Press conferences are for asking questions, not sweeping them under the rug. If there are any more questions about security risks, let them be asked, even at the risk of rebukes. The Nation needs to know about such things.

SOLUTION TO PROBLEMS OF FREEDOM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, I had an opportunity to read some excerpts from a speech given by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., before the California Federation of Young Democrats. As usual, I found Mr. Schlesinger's remarks profound and stimulating. In his most thoughtful address, he stresses that there are no easy answers to the challenges which face us around the world today.

Mr. President, it is indeed the time to beware of false prophets and those who promise snappy or back-of-the-book solutions for the struggle for freedom. It gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.'s, brilliant address before the California Federation of Young Democrats be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO BACK-OF-THE-BOOK SOLUTIONS IN FREEDOM

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

I am glad to see that the theme of your convention is "The Cost of Freedom," for a pervading illusion of the 19th century was that freedom was free, a costless benefit guaranteed by history to all virtuous and

respectable men. We know now that freedom is much more complicated than that.

Instead of being the natural condition of man and society, freedom is something that a few men in a few places have achieved through effort, dedication, self-discipline and social ingenuity. Freedom is the exception in history, not the rule; it is what men seek rather than what they have.

But they seek it nonetheless, and therein lies the hope for humanity. The instinct for self-fulfillment through free choice is obviously rooted deep in the human condition. It grows in vigor as education and economic growth and political responsibility liberate man from the chains into which most men are still born.

A FEARFUL BURDEN

Freedom is not only hard to get; it is hard to keep. The preservation of freedom requires the fashioning of institutions strong enough to preserve continuity, flexible enough to acknowledge change, resilient enough to transmit vitality and challenging enough to stimulate creativity. It requires, in short, a varied and subtle social discipline.

But it also requires self-discipline—because freedom emancipates man from external authority and thereby concentrates the obligation of responsibility on his own mind and his own conscience. "Liberty means responsibility," said Bernard Shaw. "That is why most men dread it."

Some men have found the strain of freedom intolerable. "Men will cry aloud at last," Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor warns us, "that the truth is not in freedom, for the fearful burden of free choice imposes too many cares, too many unanswerable anxieties."

To be free is to choose; and to choose is to make up one's mind; and to make up one's own mind in the whirling universe in which we live is to indulge in the most painful and hazardous of pastimes—that is, the taking of thought. This is perhaps the harshest cost of freedom.

Cogito, ergo sum, said Descartes; to think is to think for oneself and to define oneself by the thought. Those who let others do their thinking for them have ceased to be free.

But the act of thought imposes its own responsibility. To think effectively is to think honestly, soberly, carefully, intelligently. Thought is one thing, emotional self-indulgence is another. Responsible democracy requires that the two be not confused.

If I were asked to suggest the first cost of freedom, I would say that it is the renunciation of easy solutions. The mark of the dogmatist is that he is still in grade school and thinks he can find all the answers in the back of the book. He knows the truth, and everyone who rejects his truth is either a knave or a fool.

Every irritation in life, he believes, has a simple cause; every obstacle a simple explanation; every problem a simple solution. One remembers Mr. Dooley's definition of the fanatic as "a man who does what he thinks th' Lord wud do if He only knew th' facts in th' case."

THE FOOLISH FEW

As a people, we are dedicated to free choice, and we can therefore hardly complain if some of our fellow citizens choose foolishly. Throughout our history there have been those who supposed that the Republic was in some terrible danger perpetrated by a clique of sinister conspirators.

In the 1820's, honest men tried to save us from the conspiracy of the Masons. In the 1850's, the Know-Nothings tried to save us from the immigrant conspiracy. In the 1890's, the American Protective Association tried to save us from the Catholic conspiracy. In the 1920's, the Ku Klux Klan tried to save us from a conspiracy of Catholics and Jews